

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9-15 and 18, 21 and 23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 23 are independent. Claims 1, 9, 10, 11, and 23 are hereby amended. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification, specifically at Figures 7, 8, and 9 and on pages 9, 10, and 11. Changes to claims are not statements with respect to patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112 beyond the remarks herein. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. SUPPORT FOR THIS AMENDMENT

Citations to Figures and Specification locations are provided. However, such citations are provided merely as examples and are not intended to limit the interpretation of the claims or to evidence or create any estoppel.

As an example, support of the amendment can be found at paragraph [0052], which is reproduced below, of the Specification.

[0052] When the EPG retrieval system according to the third embodiment performs retrieval on the EPG data, a retrieval keyword, input from the home server 200C, the HDD recorder 400, or the PC 500, is sent to the data server 100C, retrieval on the EPG data is performed using relevant keywords extracted from the dictionary database 300C in the data server 100C, and the result of the retrieval is received by the home server 200C, the HDD recorder 400, or the PC 500. As described above, by providing the dictionary database 300C on the side of the data server 100C, the dictionary database 300C can be used in common. Accordingly, in a client having a small data storage capacity in a device such as the home server 200C, the HDD recorder 400, or the PC 500, the storage capacity is not occupied by the dictionary database 300C, so that if the contents of the dictionary database 300C are updated, maintenance of difference data does not need to be performed.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 11, which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, is amended herein, obviating the rejection.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11-13, 15, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein, et al (hereinafter, merely “Schein”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,657 to Livowsky, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Livowsky”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,165,098 to Boyer, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Boyer”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,798,785 to Hendricks, et al.

(hereinafter, merely "Hendricks") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,522 to Erdelyi, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Erdelyi").

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein, Livowsky, and Boyer, and Hendricks, and Erdelyi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,523,302 to Brown, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Brown")

Claims 10 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein, Livowsky, and Boyer, and Hendricks, and Erdelyi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,547 to Huxley, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Huxley").

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Livowsky, and Boyer and Hendricks, and Erdelyi and further in view of U.S. Pre Grant Publication No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Hatakeyama, and Boyer and Hendricks, and Erdelyi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,428 to Lee et al.

IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

...accessing a dictionary database based on an input retrieval keyword,

wherein the dictionary database is stored in a data server whereby, by providing the dictionary database in the data server, the dictionary database is used in common, and accordingly, in a client having a small data storage capacity in a home server, a HDD recorder

400, or a PC, storage capacity is not occupied by the dictionary database, and

wherein when contents of the dictionary database are updated, maintenance of difference data does not need to be performed by the home server. (Emphasis Added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Schein, Hatakeyama, Boyer, Hendricks, and Erdelyi, taken alone or in combination, fail to suggest or render predictable accessing a dictionary database based on an input retrieval keyword, wherein the dictionary database is stored in a data server whereby, by providing the dictionary database in the data server, the dictionary database is used in common, and accordingly, in a client having a small data storage capacity in a home server, a HDD recorder 400, or a PC, storage capacity is not occupied by the dictionary database, and wherein when contents of the dictionary database are updated, maintenance of difference data does not need to be performed by the home server, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Schein, Livowsky, Boyer, Hendricks, and Erdelyi, that would teach the above-identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 11 and 23 are patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 11 and 23 are patentable.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

Because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
Russell P. Blaise
Reg. No. 66,567
(212) 588-0800